

commemorate the victims of the *foibe* is only one of many factors that prove the existence of competing memories in today's Italy.

As Clifford rightly claims in the conclusion, the field of memory studies too often overlooks the question of 'the relationship between human agency and the generation and reception of collectively held narratives of the past' (p. 254). Through a clear and engaging prose, *Commemorating the Holocaust* brings the focus on those agents of memory who, belonging to three generations and with varying degrees of personal involvement in the events commemorated, continue the dialogue on the transmission of the past and its effects in contemporary society.

Erika Conti

Washington University in St Louis

[econti22@wustl.edu](mailto:econti22@wustl.edu)

© 2014, Erika Conti

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13532944.2014.970454>

**Emotion and cognition in the films of Bernardo Bertolucci**, by Silvana Serra, Kibworth Beauchamp, Troubador, 2013, xli + 193 pp., £14.95 (paperback), ISBN 978-1-78088-509-4

Confined to a wheelchair and depressed, Bernardo Bertolucci was convinced that *The Dreamers* (2003), a nostalgic reverie of sex, politics and cinema, would remain his last film. Then, after almost 10 years of cinematic indolence, a chance encounter with Niccolò Ammaniti's novel *Io e te* drove him behind the camera to direct a claustrophilic chamber piece. Bertolucci has characterised the filmmaking of *Io e te* (2012) as therapy, and, perhaps not insignificantly, the film's psychologist is wheelchair-bound. Given the director's public disclosures of his emotional state and the autobiographical affinities, one might be tempted to interpret the film from a psychoanalytic perspective. Conversely, given the director's outspoken political views and the contemporary political climate, one might equally be tempted to read the film as a retreat from politics and a restricting of art's conceptual scope.

In her comprehensive overview of Bertolucci's cinema, Silvana Serra argues that both temptations – somewhat reductively identified as being either particularly American (psychoanalysis) or Italian (politics) – must be resisted. Instead, Serra proposes a double reading that considers the full scope of filmic production through the lens of affective and cognitive theory. The result is a compelling study that incorporates this theoretical framework within a formal analysis of filmic elements (e.g. camera movement, diegetic and non-diegetic music, structural organisation and *mise-en-scène*) to explain how spectator alignment operates within complex narrations. This critical strategy erases hierarchies between supposedly commercial spectacles and so-called serious art films by analysing those elements that bring coherency to the entire cinematic project.

The argument is organised around an ample introductory section, which consists of two basic sub-headings: the first is a critical overview of previous scholarship and the second is the presentation of the theoretical methodologies that frame the research. The somewhat pedantic nature of the thesis-cum-book project is present primarily in these introductory comments.

In assessing the critical bibliography, Serra aligns her argument with that found in Francesco Casetti's 1978 monograph, *Bernardo Bertolucci*. Sharing with Casetti a preference for the

concrete over the abstract, Serra ‘posits that a more objective awareness of the true relationship between Bertolucci and his father Attilio would benefit future scholarship on the director’s work’ (p. xviii), although the premise that a single ‘true’ relationship could be articulated is questionable. On the other hand, her critique of Robert Philip Kolker’s *Bernardo Bertolucci* (1985) as privileging biographical over filmic analysis is perhaps too reductive for such a nuanced study. Although displaying an impressive command of previous scholarship, Serra’s assessments are at times too emphatic in delineating the parameters of her own critique. While this section serves to establish a scholarly dialogue – one that is further developed in the individual film analyses – it also grounds the study’s critical position. One aspect of this position is a healthy scepticism towards the value of authorial interviews as they pertain to self-commentary because they have the potential to lead the critic into intentional fallacies.

The conceptual framework of the research is organised ‘on the notion of interaction between the viewer’s cognitive and affective faculties while engaging with screen fiction’ (p. xxvii). Drawing on the works of Torben Grodel, Murray Smith, Noël Carroll, David Bordwell, Edward Branigan and Greg M. Smith, Serra advocates for a cognitive and affective approach to film studies. Although not explicitly cited, Carroll’s scathing arguments in *Mystifying Movies: Fads and Fallacies in Film Studies* (1988) denouncing film studies’ entrenched Lacanian–Althusserian–Barthesian paradigm lay the foundation for Serra’s analysis. Somewhat eclectically, the study’s theoretical underpinnings also draw on Brecht’s technique of *Verfremdungseffekt*, a defamiliarisation effect, and on Godard’s *Nouvelle Vague* aesthetics.

The analysis itself is organised into five thematic sections: ‘Pessimism and Melancholia’; ‘The Sensitizing of the Viewer: Cognitive and Intellectual Reflection’; ‘Between History and Nostalgia’; ‘The Pinnacle of the *film spettacolo*’; and ‘Women at the Forefront’. Each film is discussed methodically, beginning with an overview followed by a plot summary and then the analysis proper that applies the tenets of cognitive and affective theory, before closing with a brief conclusion. These tight readings offer the clear advantage of highlighting affinities across films. Because 15 films (from *La commare secca* to *The Dreamers*) are analysed, a sense of predictability emerges as well. By not privileging the critically acclaimed over the critically panned, previously ignored films now participate in a thematic dialogue that suggests new interpretations. Similarly, by shifting the focus to filmic elements, the significance of Vittorio Storaro, whose cinematography emphasises how colours influence perception, becomes apparent. In rejecting the psychoanalytic and political interpretations to Bertolucci’s cinema while still adhering to a *Cahiers du cinéma* aesthetic, the analysis does not explicitly question auteurism even while implicitly challenging and undermining its premises. Thus, even the scope of the volume, which is to explore how the director ‘has constructed the cognitive and emotional structures of each of his feature films in the context of a reception process based on an interrelation between cognition and emotion’ (p. 172), presents the possibility a non-auteurist interpretation.

A concise conclusion follows the film analyses. A glossary, a bibliography and a filmography are also included. In sum, *Emotion and Cognition in the Films of Bernardo Bertolucci* is a welcome and significant addition to the director’s critical bibliography. By providing a comprehensive and compelling analysis of Bertolucci’s entire cinematic production through 2003, it addresses a critical lacuna in film studies. By applying cognitive and affective theory to 40 years of Bertolucci’s cinema, this study explicates the nexus of cinematic elements and complex narrations with the emotional and intellectual engagement of spectators. Not unlike the closing shot of *Io e te*, an enigmatic freeze that leaves open the question of future directions, the conclusion of Silvana Serra’s study opens new directions for research on Bertolucci.

## References

- Carroll, N. 1988. *Mystifying Movies: Fads and Fallacies in Film Studies*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Casetti, F. 1978. *Bernardo Bertolucci*. Florence: La Nuova Italia.
- Kolker, R. P. 1985. *Bernardo Bertolucci*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Piero Garofalo  
University of New Hampshire  
[pg@unh.edu](mailto:pg@unh.edu)

© 2014, Piero Garofalo

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13532944.2014.970455>

**The knights errant of anarchy: London and the Italian anarchist diaspora (1880–1917)**, by Pietro di Paola, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 2013, 244 pp., £70.00 (hardback), ISBN 978-1-846-31969-3

In *Making Sense of Anarchism (2012)*, Davide Turcato admits that understanding anarchists is a difficult task, but he asserts that transnationalism is the key to a more profound grasp of their historical functioning. Nationalist histories have produced erroneous views of a cyclical rise and fall in anarchist activity, but a transnationalist perspective underscores the continuity of these organisations as they were forced to scatter and regroup across borders. As the first to examine the exiled Italian anarchist community in London, Pietro Di Paola's book is an essential contribution to the study of the transnational history of the anarchist diaspora.

Di Paola is a Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Media Humanities and Performance at the University of Lincoln. Having previously published related articles in *Anarchist Studies*, *European History Quarterly* and *Società e Storia*, this constitutes his first monograph and the second volume in the Studies in Labour History series from Liverpool University Press, edited by Alan Campbell. The author takes a matter-of-fact approach to detailing the activities of a community living in exile and in poverty, at the margins of mainstream political, social and cultural consciousness, fragmented by internal ideological divisions and subverted by external government forces.

In the introduction to his book, Di Paola offers a clear outline of its direction and specifies the aim of 'contribut[ing] to the historiography of diasporic anarchism by exploring practical and ideological aspects of the Italian anarchists . . . in London, one of the most significant nodes of the transnational anarchist network' (p. 5). The first two chapters reconstruct the circumstances under which London became a preferred location for Italian anarchists escaping repression and exile in Italy beginning in the 1870s. With strong traditions of free access, free trade and the presumption of innocence, England, unlike other European nations, also permitted free entry to religious and political refugees. A colony of Italian anarchist militants was firmly established in London in the 1880s. In the next chapter, Di Paola examines the internal ideological split between the 'organisationalists', led by the towering figure of Errico Malatesta, and the 'anti-organisationalists', headed by Vittorio Pini and Luigi Parmeggiani. The details of this schism highlight the inherent difficulties of sustaining political activism based on extreme individualism and anti-establishmentism. Chapter 4 is a detailed account of the publications, conferences, demonstrations and various initiatives that constituted the basis of anarchist activity in the early